



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,664	10/11/2005	Masaji Hirota	2185-0778PUS1	2594
2252	7590	01/12/2009	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			STALDER, MELISSA A	
PO BOX 747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			1793	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/12/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/552,664	Applicant(s) HIROTA ET AL.
	Examiner MELISSA STALDER	Art Unit 1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09-18-08

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The double patenting rejection of claims 7 and 8 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection over Hancock is withdrawn.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuroda (JP 11-349579) (citations are to machine English translation of corresponding JP 4013334). Kuroda teaches an epoxy made with a tungsten compound, hydrogen peroxide, a tertiary amine, and phosphoric acid.

Regarding claim 2, Kuroda teaches the use of tungstic acid, phosphotungstic acid sodium, tungstosilicic acid, tungstosilicic-acid sodium, sodium tungstate, phosphotungstic acid, and tungstosilicic acid.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection over Steinmetz is withdrawn.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda (JP 11-349579) as applied to claims 1-3 and 6 above, and further in view of Venturello (US 4,562,276). Kuroda does not teach the use of tungsten metal. Venturello teaches a peroxide composition which may contain tungsten metal (col. 3, lines 38-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the catalyst of Kuroda with the tungsten taught in Venturello because Venturello teaches that it is known in the art that organo-metal complexes of molybdenum and tungsten are catalysts suited for epoxidation of olefinic bonds with hydrogen peroxide and heterocyclic nitrogen compounds (col. 2, lines 26-33).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda (JP 11-349579) as applied to claims 1-3 and 6 above, and further in view of Hancock (US 5,367,032). Hancock teaches the conversion of epoxide to a carbonyl compound using hydrogen peroxide and a phosphorus acid and a catalyst component with tungsten or molybdenum (abstract). The epoxide can be a olefin. The pH is preferably

from 0 to 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the catalyst of Kuroda with the conversion reaction of Hancock because it is known in the art that hydrogen peroxide is an oxidizing agent that is capable of creating a carbonyl compound.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroda (JP 11-349579) as applied to claim 1-3 and 6 above, and further in view of Venturello (EP 0 606 976). Venturello teaches the production of ketones by means of oxidation of a catalyst with secondary alcohols in the presence of hydrogen peroxide. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the catalyst of Kuroda with the alcohol of Venturello because Venturello teaches the catalytic method of preparing ketones in the reaction with hydrogen peroxide and a secondary alcohol. Also, Venturello teaches that the catalyst can be prepared using a quaternary salt, phosphoric acid, and tungsten.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELISSA STALDER whose telephone number is (571)270-5832. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Melvin Curtis Mayes can be reached on 571-272-1234. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MS
December 30, 2008

/Melvin Curtis Mayes/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793